

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Gary L. Grant,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No. 4:19-cv-608-TMC
)	
Acting Warden McCabe; Associate)	
Warden Ford; Associate Warden)	
Cannon <i>a/k/a</i> Joseph Canning; Major)	ORDER
Smith; Captain Davis; Lieutenant)	
Danley; Sergeant Blackwell; Food)	
Service Director Brad <i>a/k/a</i> Bragg;)	
Head Nurse Robins; Sergeant Sally)	
Crowe; Officer Jackson,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Plaintiff Gary L. Grant, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for all pretrial proceedings. On January 17, 2020, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment, (ECF No. 105), and Plaintiff filed a response on January 30, 2020, (ECF No. 108). Now before the court is the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that the court grant summary judgment in favor of Defendants. (ECF No. 115). The Report was mailed to Plaintiff at the address he provided the court and has not been returned as undeliverable. (ECF No. 116). Therefore, Plaintiff is presumed to have received the Report. Plaintiff was advised of his right to file specific objections to the Report, (ECF No. 115-1), but failed to do so. The time for Plaintiff to object to the Report has now expired, and this matter is ripe for review.

The magistrate judge's recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). Nevertheless, "[t]he district court is only required to review *de novo* those portions of the report to which specific objections have been made, and need not conduct *de novo* review 'when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendations.'" *Farmer v. McBride*, 177 Fed. App'x 327, 330–31 (4th Cir. April 26, 2006) (quoting *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982)). The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, "[i]n the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation." *White v. Stacher*, C/A No. 6-05-1737-GRA-WMC, 2005 WL 8163324, at *1 (D.S.C. Aug. 29, 2005) (citing *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983)).

Thus, having reviewed the Report and finding no clear error, the court agrees with, and wholly adopts, the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in the Report (ECF No. 115), which is incorporated herein by reference. Therefore, the court **GRANTS** Defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 105) as to all of Plaintiff's claims.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Anderson, South Carolina
May 4, 2020

s/Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.